

## REMARKS

Claims 20-21 have been cancelled. Claims 2-4, 9-11, 13, 15, 17-18 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claim 22 has been added. Claims 2-22 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-5, 17-18, and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheung et al (hereinafter “Cheung”) (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0169760) in view of Carr JR. et al.(hereinafter “Carr”) (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0152099).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 2 the Office Action acknowledges Cheung does not teach sharing advertising revenues. Carr teaches a method, which aggregates a “plurality of independently owned commercial office buildings under a single brand identity” (Paragraph 0009) called “ACME Office” (Paragraph 0017), such that “Each alliance negotiated by ACME Office for the benefit of its plurality of members entities typically would include an allocation of some portion of the revenues generated by the vendor from each participating member entity’s office buildings to ACME Office” (Paragraph 0034) as stated by the Examiner on pages 7-8 of the Office Action.

Carr does not teach “receiving one or more bid amounts for a keyword, wherein each bid amount is associated with a listing; returning one or more listings responsive to a query associated with the keyword, wherein the listings are organized in an order associated with the respective bid amounts of the responsive listings; receiving an indication that a selected listing included in the responsive listings has been selected; and *crediting to a referral service associated with the selected listing a portion of a bid amount received from an advertiser for the selected listing; wherein returning one or more listings responsive to the query includes receiving from each of one or more listing sources included in a plurality of listing sources a corresponding set of one or more listings responsive to the query and for each listing a corresponding bid amount.*” (Emphasis added) as recited in the amended claim 2. Support for the amendment to claim 2 may be found, without limitation, in the above-captioned application at p. 11, lines 1-18, and Figures 2, 3 and 4. As such, claim 2 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-16 depend from claim 2 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above. Support for the new claim 22 may be found, without limitation, in the above-captioned application at p. 11, lines 1-18, and Figures 3 and 4. As such, claim 22 depend from claim 2 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons above.

Claim 17 recites systems for carrying out the methods of claim 2. Therefore, it is believed that claim 17 is also allowable.

Claims 18-19 depend from claim 17 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Dated: 11/13/2007

Respectfully submitted,

William J. James

William J. James  
Registration No. 40,661  
V 408-973-2592  
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP  
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200  
Cupertino, CA 95014